



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,061	08/02/2001	Christoph A. Aktas	2001 P 13665 US	7577

7590 10/15/2004

Siemens Corporation
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

CLARK, ISAAC R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/922,061

Applicant(s)

AKTAS ET AL.

Examiner

Isaac R Clark

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/02/2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08/02/2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/22/2002.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Priority

2. No claim for priority has been made in this application.
3. The effective filing date for the subject matter in the pending claims in this application is 08/02/2001.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "keyword lists" and the "filter means" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of

Art Unit: 2154

the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 5, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Owens et al. (US Patent 6,633,630) hereinafter Owens.

7. As per claim 5, Owens teaches a multimedia mailbox system (Abstract, col. 5, lines 14-25), comprising: a message store 10 for storing multimedia messages (Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 59-65); a conversion means for converting non-text messages to text (Fig. 12, col. 13, lines 57-60); and a filter means for determining high priority messages (Fig. 8; col. 11, lines 62-67).

8. As per claims 15 and 16, claim 15 and 16 are method claims covering the same subject matter as claim 5. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected for the same reason as claim 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owens et al. (US Patent 6,633,630) hereinafter Owens in view of Pollack et al. (US Patent 6,578,025) Pollack.

11. As per claim 1, Owens et al. teaches a multimedia mailbox system (Abstract, col. 5, lines 14-25) comprising: a message store 10 for storing multimedia messages (Fig. 1; col. 5, lines 59-65); a conversion means for converting non-text messages to text (Fig. 12, col. 13, lines 57-60);

12. Owens teaches performing keyword searches on the text of messages (col. 11, lines 65-66) but fails to explicitly teach a summarization means for automatically summarizing text.

13. Pollack teaches a means for automatically summarizing a message (Fig. 1, item 126; col. 7, lines 18-23).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Owens and Pollack because to provide an automated means for summarize the text of incoming messages because they both deal with handling incoming electronic messages in a mailbox. Furthermore, the

Art Unit: 2154

teaching of Pollack to provide a summarizing means would allow reduce the text necessary to review when screening messages for relevancy or urgency.

15. As per claim 2, Owens teaches a multimedia mailbox system according to claim 1 wherein keyword lists are used to prioritize messages, but fails to explicitly teach that the keyword lists are used to provide message summaries.

16. Pollack teaches a keyword driven summarization means (col. 9, lines 59-62 and col. 10, lines 2-5).

17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Owens and Pollack because to provide a keyword driven summarize means because they both deal with handling incoming electronic messages in a mailbox. Furthermore, the teaching of Pollack to drive the summarization means with lists of keywords would allow tailoring the summarization means to the interest and needs of a particular user (col. 9, lines 9-14).

18. As per claim 3, Owens fails to explicitly teach a multimedia mailbox system according to claim 1 wherein the summarization means is driven by a plurality of lists of keywords, each list of keywords being linked to one of a message subject.

19. Pollack teaches a summarization means (Fig. 1, item 126) is driven by a plurality of lists of keywords, each list of keywords being linked to one of a message subject and a message sender (col. 9, lines 59-62 and col. 10, lines 2-5, user profiles include keywords; col. 11, lines 10-17; multiple profiles corresponding to multiple message topics).

Art Unit: 2154

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Owens and Pollack because to provide a plurality of keyword lists corresponding to different topics for driving the summarization means because they both deal with handling incoming electronic messages in a mailbox. Furthermore, the teaching of Pollack to drive the summarization means with a plurality of lists of keywords corresponding to various message subjects would allow tailoring the summarization to the topic of interest (col. 11, lines 12-14).

21. As per claim 4, Owens teaches a multimedia mailbox system according to claim 1, further comprising: a filter means for determining high priority messages based on keyword filtering (Fig. 8; col. 11, lines 62-67); and an automatic means for automatically sending messages high priority messages to a designated user (col. 12, lines 9-13).

22. Owens fails to teach forwarding a summary of high priority messages to a designated user.

23. Pollack teaches automatic forwarding of summaries of messages (col. 6, lines 48-52, message information delivered to users; col. 7, lines 19-21; message information includes summary of message).

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Owens and Pollack because to forward summaries of high priority messages to a designated user because they both deal with handling incoming electronic messages in a mailbox. Furthermore, the teaching of

Art Unit: 2154

Pollack forward a summary would facilitate quick evaluation and response to high priority messages (Pollack, col. 8, lines 36-42).

25. As per claim 6, Owens fails to teach a multimedia mailbox system according to claim 5 further comprising summarization means for automatically summarizing text.

26. Pollack teaches a means for automatically summarizing a message (Fig. 1, item 126; col. 7, lines 18-23).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Owens and Pollack because to provide an automated means for summarize the text of incoming messages because they both deal with handling incoming electronic messages in a mailbox. Furthermore, the teaching of Pollack to provide a summarizing means would allow reduce the text to be reviewed when screening messages for relevancy or urgency.

28. As per claim 7, Owens fails to teach a multimedia mailbox system according to claim 6 wherein said summarization means is driven by a list of keywords.

29. Pollack teaches a keyword driven summarization means (col. 9, lines 59-62 and col. 10, lines 2-5).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Owens and Pollack because to provide a keyword driven summarize means because they both deal with handling incoming electronic messages in a mailbox. Furthermore, the teaching of Pollack to drive the summarization means with lists of keywords would allow tailoring the summarization means to the interest and needs of a particular user (col. 9, lines 9-14).

Art Unit: 2154

31. As per claim 8, Owens fails to teach a multimedia mailbox system according to claim 7 wherein said summarization means is driven by a plurality of lists of keywords, each list of keywords being linked to one of a message subject and a message sender

32. Pollack teaches a summarization means (Fig. 1, item 126) is driven by a plurality of lists of keywords, each list of keywords being linked to one of a message subject and a message sender (col. 9, lines 59-62 and col. 10, lines 2-5, user profiles include keywords; col. 11, lines 10-17; multiple profiles corresponding to multiple message topics).

33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Owens and Pollack because to provide a plurality of keyword lists corresponding to different topics for driving the summarization means because they both deal with handling incoming electronic messages in a mailbox. Furthermore, the teaching of Pollack to drive the summarization means with a plurality of lists of keywords corresponding to various message subjects would allow tailoring the summarization to the topic of interest (col. 11, lines 12-14).

34. As per claim 9, Owens teaches a multimedia mailbox system according to claim 8 further comprising automatic means for automatically sending a high priority messages to a designated user (Fig. 8; col. 11, lines 62-67; col. 12, lines 9-13).

35. Owens fails to teach forwarding a summary of high priority messages to a designated user.

Art Unit: 2154

36. Pollack teaches automatic forwarding of summaries of messages (col. 6, lines 48-52, message information delivered to users; col. 7, lines 19-21; message information includes summary of message).

37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Owens and Pollack because to forward summaries of high priority messages to a designated user because they both deal with handling incoming electronic messages in a mailbox. Furthermore, the teaching of Pollack forward a summary would facilitate quick evaluation and response to high priority messages (Pollack, col. 8, lines 36-42).

38. As per claim 10, claim 10 is a method claim covering the same subject matter as claim 1. Claim 10 is rejected for the same reason as claim 1.

39. As per claim 11, claim 11 is rejected for the same reason as claim 2.

40. As per claim 12, claim 12 is rejected for the same reason as claim 3.

41. As per claims 13 and 14, claims 13 and 14 are rejected for the same reason as claim 4.

42. As per claim 17, claim 17 is rejected for the same reason as claim 6.

43. As per claim 18, claim 18 is rejected for the same reason as claim 7.

44. As per claim 19, claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as claim 8.

Conclusion

45. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show

Art Unit: 2154

the state of the art with respect to "Methods and apparatus for automatically summarizing messages stored in unified multimedia mailboxes".

- i. Martin US 6,606,373 Summarizing/translating messages using keywords.
- ii. Ayyadurai US 6,718,368 Analysis of text messages including, OCR of facsimile, automated replies
- iii. Griffith et al. US 6,366,651 Automatic forwarding of messages after conversion to text or audio format.
- iv. Nelson US 6,061,718 Multimedia message handling system with format conversion and transmission to mobile station
- v. Tullis et al. US 5,802,314 Multimedia message handling system with conversion of images, faxes, and voice to text.
- vi. Cohen et al. US 4,837,798 Unified multimedia mailbox system with automated notification of messages


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac R Clark whose telephone number is (571)272-3961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Irc



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100